

REMARKS

Claims 1-28, 31-33, and 36-38 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated August 8, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19, 25-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle Forms® Advanced Techniques, ch. 10, pp. 1-18* ("*Oracle*") in view of *Austin* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0037119) ("*Austin*").
- B.) Rejected claims 6, 16, 20, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092) ("*Francis*").
- C.) Rejected claims 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Laverty, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,593) ("*Laverty*") and further in view of *Austin*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner's disposition below. Claims 1, 7, 9-11, 17, 19, 20, and 25 have been amended. Claims 8, 18, and 26-38 have been canceled.

- A.) Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19, 25-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle Forms® Advanced Techniques, ch. 10, pp. 1-18* ("*Oracle*") in view of *Austin* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0037119) ("*Austin*"):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, and 25, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to initiating loading a document as a data stream into memory. While the document is being loaded as a data stream into memory, an input filter analyses the data stream to identify whether an embedded object/data is contained in the document. And also while the document is being loaded into memory, when it is determined that the first program is an unavailable program, a predetermined second format different from the first format that is suitable for use with a second program that is available on the data processing system is identified in a lookup table and the embedded object/data is automatically converted from a first format, which corresponds to a first program, to a second format that is different from the first format and suitable for use with a second program.

Thus, Applicants' claimed invention inventively converts an embedded object/data within a document "on-the-fly" while the document is being loaded as a data stream into memory. This provides a seamless and conversion that may not require user interaction. Further, when it is determined that the first program is an unavailable program, the predetermined second format is identified in a lookup table and the embedded object/data is automatically converted from a first format to a second format.

i. **Oracle in view of Austin and Applicants' discussed background art fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter as claimed**

As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Oracle* and *Austin* fail to disclose an import filter. However, the Examiner alleges that *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of Applicants' discussed background art suggests Applicants' claimed invention including an import filter. Applicants disagree.

In the specification, Applicants describe that import filters are known in the art. However, there is no motivation in Applicants' description of the background art nor in *Oracle* nor *Austin* to combine an import filter with *Oracle* and *Austin* to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention of using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory, and to convert the embedded object/data "on-the-fly." *Oracle* and *Austin* fail to suggest using a mechanism such as an import filter. And the background art that is discussed in Applicants' specification also failed to suggest using an import filter as claimed by Applicants.

Therefore, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of Applicants' description of the background art fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory, and to convert the embedded object/data "on-the-fly."

ii. **Oracle in view of Austin and Applicants' discussed background art fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting embedded data while a document is loaded into memory**

The Examiner has used impermissible hindsight to allege that *Austin* converts data while a document is being loaded into memory. The Examiner alleges that *Austin*'s conversion process "is all accomplished while a data stream is being loaded into memory." *Office Action of 1/23/07*, page 13. Nowhere does *Austin* teach this. Instead, *Austin* merely describes that a data access

nodes receives data from a data source, and the “data access node may then convert the received data.” *Austin* [0122] (emphasis added). Thus, *Austin* clearly converts data after it has been loaded into memory. Applicants respectfully submit the Examiner has used impermissible hindsight to try to stretch *Austin*’s teachings to cover the case in which data is converted while being loaded into memory. However, *Austin* clearly does not state that data is converted while being loaded into memory and provides no suggestion to do so.

Oracle merely allows a user to manually initiate conversion of an OLE object to a new format, after the related document has been loaded into memory, by selecting the convert option on the Object submenu of the OLE popup menu. (*Oracle*, page 17).

Thus, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and Applicants’ description of the background art fails to disclose or suggest converting data while it is being loaded into memory.

iii. Oracle in view of Austin and Applicants’ discussed background art fails to disclose or suggest identifying a second format in a lookup table

The cited art fails to disclose or suggest identifying a second format in a lookup table. Nowhere do *Oracle*, *Austin*, and the discussed background art disclose or suggest identifying a second format in a lookup table and then converting data into the second format while a document is being loaded into memory.

For at least this additional reason, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and the discussed background art fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, and 25.

Claims 2-5 and 12-15 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 6, 16, 20, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oracle in view of Austin and further in view of Francis, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092) (“Francis”);

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Regarding claims 6 and 16:

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable over *Oracle* in view of *Austin* as discussed above. *Francis* still fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory. Further, *Francis* also fails to disclose or suggest using a lookup table to identify a second format. Thus, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 11.

Claims 6 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

Regarding claims 20-24:

Applicants' independent claim 20, as amended, also claims using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory. Further, claim 20 claims subject matter relating to identifying a second format in a lookup table and automatically converting an object/data from a first format to the second format.

As discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 11, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis* fails to disclose or suggest 1) using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory and 2) to identifying a second format in a lookup table and automatically converting an object/data from a first format to the second format. Thus, for at least these reason, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis* fails to disclose or suggest claim 20.

Claims 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 20 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

- C.) Rejection of claims 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Lavery, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,593)* ("*Lavery*") and further in view of *Austin*:

Claims 36-38 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/
Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No. 45,034
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000
Customer No. 58328